

full terrorism

S 4574

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 21, 1986

are eligible but are not participating in the food stamp programs. So do we.

She said the task force wants to find out if people's basic nutritional needs are being met. So do we.

We are, most of us, exceedingly uncomfortable being labeled as the kind of folks who would let people go hungry.

If the study is right and something has gone wrong, we want to fix it. After years and years of feeding a large part of the country—of the world—we ought to know something in South Dakota about feeding the hungry.

THE BATTLE AGAINST TERRORISM

Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to the need for a better definition, or perhaps a study or recommendation, on the part of the White House regarding Executive Order 12333 which prohibits any member of the U.S. Government from being involved in assassinations.

Mr. President, in the battle against terrorism, many options must be considered, including the kind of direct military actions we took against Libyan targets last week.

Another option which is prohibited to our Government is the assassination of individual terrorists. That option is precluded by section 2.11 of Executive Order 12333, which reads:

Prohibition on Assassination. No person employed by or acting on behalf of the United States Government shall engage in, or conspire to engage in, assassination.

This order has been in effect since December 4, 1981, but the prohibition against assassination has been in existence since Executive Order 12036 was issued on January 24, 1978.

Although I am not advocating a change in this policy, it is clear that Executive Order 12333 effectively requires military operations against larger targets whenever we decide to use force to combat terrorism. It is virtually impossible for us to single out individual terrorists for extermination or elimination. We could bomb cities or neighborhoods known to harbor specific terrorists, but in the process of doing that there is a risk of killing or injuring other people, too.

An unstated justification for the U.S. prohibition on the use of assassination as an instrument of national policy is that it protects our own leaders from assassination. In the aftermath of alleged assassination attempts against Fidel Castro, and subsequent Cuban plots against high American officials, it was assumed that the renunciation of assassination as a foreign policy tool would reduce possibility of physical violence against U.S. officials.

Mr. President, I do not propose that we revert to the age of Machiavelli, when assassination was a common instrument of state policy. But I do believe we should broaden the President's options for coping with terrorism. The military option, as demonstrated in the Libyan case last week, is a massive tool with which to pursue terrorists. I do not question the propri-

ety of utilizing that option in this case, and I do support the President's action. But we should be considering whether there are other ways to combat terrorists than by aerial or missile bombardment of cities.

We may be in a new era in which warfare is conducted by terrorism. If that is the case, the President and Congress should consider whether new retaliatory options should be developed. If he feels they are necessary, Congress should welcome any Presidential legislative proposals which could broaden the opportunities for effective action against the terrorist menace.

Mr. President, let me cite an example. As I understand our current law, if the President of the United States were to know of one specific terrorist who had murdered several Americans, had documentation on tape of the murders, and knew that the terrorist was living in a country that did not permit extradition, then there would be a justification for bombing a military compound or a village in which that person lived. If our objective were to retaliate, which might endanger many other innocent people, then we could act in that manner. But if this person were living alone in a house, in an open area, it would violate our Executive order to go after him specifically.

I do not know what the future holds in terms of terrorist activities. I hope this dies down, and I do not know if this is an appropriate response.

There was some speculation that part of our objective in Libya was to kill Qadhafi, but we ended up killing his daughter and several other people, which perhaps set our own foreign policy back a bit in terms of our ultimate objective. I do support what the President did.

The point I am making is that this Senator would welcome any legislative proposals which would broaden the opportunities for effective action against the terrorist menace, and the Office of the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, State, and the CIA could well make such recommendations.

I know that it is repugnant to our thinking and repugnant in a democracy to even talk of such things, but we may be living in an era in which, to protect the lives of American citizens, we might need to consider changing that Executive order.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of rule VI of the Senate, I request the consent of the Senate to be absent from April 24 through April 30 for the purpose of discharging the duties of the president of the North Atlantic Assembly, for attending a conference, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR PROXMIRE'S ATTENDANCE RECORD

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, on this day 20 years ago, Lyndon Johnson of Texas occupied the White House. I was a young lawyer in private practice. My regard for the feelings of my colleagues prevents me from recalling just how young I was in 1966. But my years were few. My esteemed senior colleague, Senator EAGLETON, was the Lieutenant Governor of Missouri and well launched on his illustrious career.

I rise today to honor a Senator who was completing a decade of distinguished service to the State of Wisconsin and to the Nation on April 20, 1966. I refer to our colleague Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

The date April 20, 1966, is significant, Mr. President, because it is the last time that Senator PROXMIRE was absent for a rollcall vote in the Senate. The vote he missed was a rollcall of 63 to 21 in favor of adopting a resolution to authorize the Finance Committee to increase its permanent professional staff by six and to hire six clerical employees on a temporary basis.

I am confident that he still rues having missed a chance to vote against more congressional staff. Since missing that vote, Senator PROXMIRE has cast 9,178 consecutive rollcall votes.

Since 1973, Senator PROXMIRE has held the record for consecutive rollcall votes. Since 1978, he has held the record for consecutive years without a miss. He has cast more votes in the Senate than any other Member, past or present. Truly, he is an amazing person.

To serve for 20 years without missing a rollcall vote is an awesome accomplishment. I consider it a privilege to serve with Senator PROXMIRE and to join in honoring him on this day.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

April 21 1986

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 4573

stance Mary Towers, and his four children, Christina, Maureen, Maria, and Michael, for their support and encouragement in his role.

Mr. President, I had the great privilege to be a guest in his official residence in Mexico City, and I have had the honor of seeing this fine U.S. Ambassador in action. He speaks fluent Spanish and has, thus, been unusually effective in promoting American concerns in Mexico during a most difficult tenure.

Mr. Gavin's success in Mexico should not come as a surprise because he is uniquely qualified for his role. Ambassador Gavin was born in Los Angeles, CA, attended St. Johns Military Academy and Villanova Preparatory, and Stanford University, where he received senior honors in economics and in the history of Latin America.

Ambassador Gavin served in the Navy during the Korean conflict as an air intelligence officer, in Latin America as a flag lieutenant, and as Pan American affairs officer to the commandant of the 15th Naval District. During his Navy service he received four battle commendations, and two decorations by foreign governments.

Ambassador Gavin's public service career has been in the fields of entertainment and business. From 1961 to 1973, he was special adviser to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States. He also pursued liaison work with the U.S. Department of State while serving in the Executive Office of the President. Mr. Gavin also served as a member of the board of the Screen Actors Guild, and was its president for two terms.

After 1973, Ambassador Gavin resumed his business activities.

Ambassador Gavin was nominated for the post of the Ambassador to Mexico in March 1981, and was confirmed by the Senate in April. He is currently the longest serving U.S. Ambassador in Latin America. He is also chief of one of the largest American delegations abroad, with over 1,000 Americans and Mexican employees representing more than a dozen United States Government agencies.

I am personally regretful that such a fine Ambassador will be leaving such an important post, but I know that Ambassador Gavin has other responsibilities also. I know that many other Senators also wish him well in his new career.

HUNGER IN SOUTH DAKOTA?

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, as one who holds two Harvard graduate degrees, I have the utmost respect for the Harvard faculty. As my colleagues well know, studies conducted by Harvard scientists and researchers are among the best in the Nation. However, as a South Dakotan, I find it necessary to respond to one of Harvard's recent studies which involved South Dakotans.

Harvard's School of Public Health and the "Physicians Task Force on Hunger in America" identified 150 "hunger counties" in the United States which have a high rate of poverty but low rates of food stamp participation. My home State of South Dakota was found to have 28 of the hungriest counties in the Nation. This is quite shocking for a State which produces food for the rest of the Nation and the world.

The results of the study illustrate the severe financial problems in the farm community. The depressed farm prices and continually rising costs of production have put many farmers' and ranchers' incomes below the poverty level. Farm prices are at the lowest level in decades. This depressed farm income also translates into hard times for main street businesses. While food stamps provide greatly needed assistance for many South Dakotans, higher farm prices would help South Dakota residents much more in the long term.

I point out a few factors which apparently were not taken into consideration by the visiting researchers. One indication of nutritional deprivation in infants and children is the infant mortality rate. According to a letter I received from the South Dakota Secretary of Health, South Dakota's 1984 white infant mortality rate was the second lowest in the Nation. South Dakota has already met the Surgeon General's 1990 goal for low birth-weight births and infant mortality for whites.

While the Indian population in South Dakota has a considerably higher infant mortality rate, only two of the so-called "hunger counties" have a significant Indian population. American Indian reservation lands were not included in the study because various commodity programs are available there. Thus, over 60 percent of our Indian population live in counties not designated as hungry.

Another health indicator is longevity. Longevity for South Dakota's men and women is above the national average. In fact, we rank 12th in the Nation. South Dakota women have one of the longest life expectancy rates in the Nation. Here in Washington, DC, life expectancy for women is 73.7, compared to South Dakota's 79.2. Men living in the Nation's Capital can expect to live only 64.6 years, compared to 72.1 in South Dakota. Agricultural accidents in South Dakota contribute to the lower expectancy for men.

South Dakotans are a hard-working and proud people. They take great pride in their livelihood and their families. In South Dakota, there is a strong sense of community. People pull together and help each other through hard times, rather than depending on Government handouts. The Food Stamp Program is a valuable Federal program that assists many South Dakotans. But, a low partici-

tion rate does not mean vast numbers of people are hungry or starving. South Dakota farmers have the capability to produce a large share of their own food needs. Large vegetable gardens are often maintained and farm animals are butchered for meat. With hard work, many farm families may enjoy a more nutritional diet than the average American, at a much lower cost to the Government. Therefore, South Dakotans should be commended for effectively using, but not abusing, the Food Stamp Program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on this subject from the March 9, 1986, Aberdeen American News be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE AWAIT WITH SOME TREPIDATION THE STUDY ON HUNGER

It was, indeed, something of a shock when it was announced in January that South Dakota has 28 counties where people were going hungry.

It seemed incredible then and it still does.

But a report compiled by the School of Public Health at Harvard University and the Physicians Task Force on Hunger not only listed 28 South Dakota counties on the hunger list but listed South Dakota second in the nation, behind only Texas on that hunger list.

The report ranked counties where more than 20 percent of the people live below the federal poverty level of \$10,609 a year for a family of four and where fewer than one-third of eligible residents actually get food stamps.

That must account for it, we thought, this business of food stamps. Folks in South Dakota are too proud to accept food stamps if they don't need them. Sure there may be people below the poverty level but hunger? That's for Ethiopia. That's not Harding County (which was no. 4 in the nation). That's not Campbell County (no. 10 in the nation). There must be some mistake. How can you have hungry people among you and not know about it?

Oh, sure, we know there are poor people among us who need help. We see people using food stamps and we know there is a need for the Salvation Army pantry to provide food help to people. But hunger, the kind of hunger we see on TV, the kind of hunger that never goes away, the kind that haunts the eyes of babies? There must be some mistake. We take care of ourselves and our own don't we?

So we have been waiting with some trepidation as a group, part of the Physicians Task Force on Hunger, came to South Dakota to examine the situation. And we are still waiting, still with some trepidation.

There has been considerable speculation that the combination of poverty-level income and food stamp use, on which the original rankings were made, may be a faulty yardstick in a place like South Dakota where a \$10,000 annual income goes farther than it might go elsewhere and where, as we said, people are less apt to apply for food stamps if they don't really need them.

And the task force confirmed some of that along with unique local problems and embarrassment of those applying for food stamps.

A staff member said the task force wants to know why there are so many people who

April 21 1986

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 4613

nounced the 1986 Handicapped American of the Year. On April 30 that celebrated award will be presented to Mr. Ralph "Chad" Colley of Barling, AR, who lost both legs and an arm while serving in Vietnam.

While Americans all over this great country have joined in honoring the accomplishments of Mr. Colley, I cannot help but add that the people of Arkansas take special pride in the inspiring achievements of one of our most distinguished citizens.

For Chad has proven that you don't need legs to chase your dreams. What you do need is boundless energy, enthusiasm, and determination to overcome even the greatest of obstacles. As the possessor of these admirable qualities, Chad has been singled out as the Handicapped American of the Year.

In 1966, after graduating with honors from North Georgia College, Chad Colley received a commission in the U.S. Army. On July 21, 1968, Colley, then an officer with the Army's 101st Airborne Division, was leading a company of men on a combat mission some 45 miles northwest of Saigon when a land mine exploded, throwing him into the air and resulting in the amputation of three limbs.

Remarkably, just 3 days after he was wounded Chad wrote a letter to his wife, Betty Ann, saying, "Even though I'm banged up pretty bad, I'm still me. I can put my loss of limbs into an asset. I have a big challenge to undertake now."

Chad Colley wasted no time facing his new challenge. Within a year after sustaining his injuries, he was already working as a real estate broker. Since then, he has held positions as sales manager for the largest homebuilder in western Arkansas and as a loan manager for a Federal savings and loan association. Today Chad is president of Colley Home Center in Barling, AR.

Apart from his business activities, Chad invests much of his time working with issues affecting the handicapped. He has been an active member of the Disabled American Veterans [DAV] Organization for several years, and in 1984 he was elected to serve a 1-year term as national commander of the DAV—that organization's highest office.

The list of accolades this man has received over the years is long indeed. He is a special human being with special inner strength. His unflappable determination to overcome life's setbacks and give whatever it takes to reach his goals is truly inspirational.

I congratulate Chad Colley on being selected the 1986 Handicapped American of the Year.●

cize these clearly self-defense actions, but some Members have complained that they were not consulted adequately or early enough. Some have suggested that the war powers resolution be strengthened by expanding the consultation requirement and adding detailed and specific consultative procedures.

Mr. President, expanding the war powers resolution would be the biggest mistake we in Congress could make. The statute could not and did not bind President Reagan from acting to defend American citizens against terrorist attacks originating in Libya. Or from rescuing 1,000 American students and other citizens in Grenada.

It could not and did not prevent President Ford in 1975 from rescuing the American merchant vessel *Mayaguez* and freeing its 39 American crew members after they were seized by Cambodian Communist military forces. Nor could it or did it stop President Ford from evacuating Americans and others from South Vietnam and Cambodia in 1975 before the capture of Saigon and Phnom Penh by enemy troops.

In fact, Congress' failure to act on President Ford's request for legislation authorizing the evacuation of United States citizens and Allied people from Indochina is one of the sorriest episodes in American history. Weeks after his request, while a confused Congress was still debating the issue, President Ford announced that he had completed the rescue missions on his own constitutional authority.

The point is that the President of the United States cannot under our Constitution be hamstrung by legislative restrictions that attempt to regulate foreign policy with narrow specificity. Congress cannot and should not tie the President's hands in taking actions which he decides are needed in the national safety.

War in this world cannot be ended by legislation. Foreign policy cannot be conducted by amendments. I should like to think that we will see a day when the moral forces of the world might prevail and when all nations can understand the stupidity of war. History instructs, however, that until that day arrives, the only means of our security is to maintain a proper defense for the country, its people and their freedoms.

A credible defense requires the coherent and uniform direction of the national forces, something which is not to be found in a legislative Chamber of 535 Members, many of whom are often more occupied with questions of political opportunism and their own reelection than they are with the Nation's real interests.

Mr. President, the framers of the constitution knew the legislative branch could not be depended upon for prompt and effective action in every emergency. They remembered that the Continental Congress had interfered with General Washington's

plans time after time with disastrous results. The framers wanted to correct this defect. Thus, they provided Congress with power to raise and support the Armed Forces, but they left the direction of those forces, once established, with the President, whom they designated as the Commander-in-Chief and to whom they gave all the executive power.

During its formative years, the United States was concerned primarily with securing its borders against foreign powers whose possessions encircled our Nation and most Americans were concerned with developing their country's great potential for growth and economic progress. Today, the United States stretches across a continent and beyond and stands as the largest, most powerful source of freedom and liberty in the world.

With this new status has come the unavoidable realization that in a world of instant communications, modern technology and interrelated economies, the United States cannot protect its own citizens and liberties unless it carries a major role in preventing aggression and acts of terrorism against our people and our vital interests.

In order to conduct a serious and responsible foreign policy, the President has a duty to recognize and meet challenges to our Nation and citizens in the early stages of any impending danger. If the war powers resolution or any other legislative impediment should compel him to wait or incapacitate him from action until everyone agrees the threat is clear beyond any controversy, the cost of resistance may become prohibitive with no choice left other than submission to aggression or all out war.

To sum it up, Mr. President, the survival of the American experiment in freedom under representative government may depend upon the recognition by Congress of the simple fact that the President needs and was given some flexibility in deciding when to act in the safety of the Nation and its people.

The war powers resolution may be an unconstitutional invasion of Presidential prerogative, as I believe. Or, it may be an abuse of power by Congress in a fuzzy zone of constitutional law. Whatever its legality, it should be seen for what it really is, a dangerous barrier to American security. We can amend it, as the majority leader and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. DENTON] have proposed in S. 2335 to specifically authorize counterterrorist initiatives by the President, or we can repeal the entire statute, as I have proposed in S. 305. I prefer to repeal it outright now before it causes a grave constitutional crisis that may endanger the Nation at a time when immediate, decisive action is demanded.●

LIBYA AND THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, most Members of Congress approved the recent United States air strikes against Libya or at least did not criti-

ADOPTÉES WITHOUT STIGMAS

● **Mr. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, as cochairman of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, I bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article about adoption which appeared in the New York Times on April 19, 1986.

The article, entitled "Adoptees, Without Stigmas," and written by William L. Pierce, Ph.D., the president of the National Committee for Adoption, describes the results of two recent research studies on adoptees which dispel a popular myth about the mental health of adoptees.

Too little information about adoption is available and too little attention is paid to the benefits of adoption for all concerned—the child, the biological parents, and the adoptive parents. Talk shows feature the few unhappy adoptees on crusades to locate their biological parents. The emotional dilemmas of adoption are a fashionable story line on soap operas and TV movies. But the much more common experience of adoption is a positive, loving one for all involved.

I have dedicated myself to spreading the word about the positive aspects of adoption and exposing the false myths which have developed about adoption. Dr. Pierce's article is a much-needed dissemination of recent research findings on adoption and I applaud his efforts.

I ask that Dr. Pierce's article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 19, 1986]

ADOPTÉES, WITHOUT STIGMAS

(By William L. Pierce)

WASHINGTON.—In recent years, adopted persons, especially adolescents, have increasingly been described as dependent, fearful, hostile, insecure and abnormal. The popular myth has it that adopted children have more mental health problems than the nonadopted, simply because they are adopted.

There are two main reasons why the myth was created and kept alive. First, research studies of the early 1960's, which claimed to find the problem, were based on small samples taken from mental health clinics or psychiatric case studies. By definition, the samples were loaded in favor of finding mental health problems. Second, groups and individuals, often motivated by personal unhappiness, sought radical changes in standard adoption practices and used those studies and their own first-person stories to gain attention and popularize the misconception with the general public.

But those early and inadequate research studies have long been open to question. And now, on the basis of two recent, superior studies of nonclinical populations, we can lay to rest the myth that adopted persons have more mental problems than nonadopted.

One study, by Leslie Stein and Janet Hoopes, published by the Child Welfare League of America in 1985, was part of a project that tracked adoptive families for nearly 25 years. It concluded in part, "Evidence suggesting that the adoptee has greater or more sustained difficulty with the tasks of adolescence was not found, indicating that adoptive status, in and of itself,

is not predictive of heightened stress among adolescents." It said that "as a group, the adolescent adoptees interviewed were doing quite well."

A second study, published in 1985 by Kathryn Marquis and Richard Detweiler, was also based on a study of subjects drawn from a nonclinical—that is, "normal"—population. It found that "contrary to expectations, adopted persons are significantly more confident and view others more positively than their nonadopted peers," that they have a "more internal locus of control than their nonadopted peers" and that adoptive parents were "significantly" more "comforting, predictable, protectively concerned and helpful" than nonadoptive parents.

Leslie Stein and Janet Hoopes hoped their results would dispel some of the "dire myths" about the "identity problems in adolescent adoptees." Kathryn Marquis and Richard Detweiler, found no evidence of the "negative characteristics of dependency, fearfulness, tenseness, hostility, loneliness, insecurity, abnormality, inferiority, poor self-image, or lack of confidence." Even a recent study of adopted persons drawn from a mental health setting, by Paul and Evelyn Brinich, asserts that "the majority of adoptions can justly be characterized as successes."

The finding that adopted persons are not at risk simply because they are adopted should set the stage for a reaffirmation of the value of adoption in our society.

First, all of those most directly affected by adoption—adopted people, birth parents and adoptive parents—can be confident that adoption works well.

Second, the data should reinforce the commitment of the adoption field to a continuation of sound, traditional practice. After all, the primary client of the adoption service, the child, has been shown by research to be doing fine.

Third, the research should be helpful to the media, in that the adopted person will no longer be stigmatized as pathological—or inferior—simply because she or he is adopted. One hopes that in time we'll see fewer sensational, negative stories. One can even hope that the soap operas will stop using adoption as an elixir whenever the plot lags.

Finally, the public may come to realize that adopted people are generally like everyone else—individuals who are successes or failures largely on the basis of their own efforts. Adopted people are neither strange nor special. They are simply individuals who have joined families in a different way than most people. They want neither pity nor praise. They just want to be able to live their lives with the families that are very real and very permanent to them, without stigma or headlines.●

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

● **Mr. BOREN.** Mr. President, the cries for reform of our congressional campaign finance laws are loud and clear. The public is increasingly aware of the critical growth of special interest influence in our Congress. Because of this understanding of the problems which at least, indirectly contribute to the current, legislative stalemate in Congress, we can hope to see substantial reform in this session of Congress.

In October of last year, when I announced I would attempt to bring my proposal to limit the influence of political action committees and modify our campaign finance laws, it was with

the intention of putting this vital issue squarely on the national agenda for action. It is my hope that with the agreements made by the distinguished majority leader and the leadership of the chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee, we can address this issue on the floor very soon in the next couple of months.

My proposal, which is pending as an amendment to S. 655 on the Senate Calendar, has a broad base of support. I am very pleased that this week, my distinguished colleague from Delaware, Senator BIDEN, has joined as a cosponsor of S. 1806. Mr. President, now 11 Members of this body have joined in putting forth this legislation as an attempt to put confidence back in our congressional elections.

An example of the kind of questions that can be raised by our current campaign financing methods can be found in a recent newspaper article. I ask that this article from the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Some Ways and Means Members Saw a Surge in Contributions During Tax-Overhaul Battle," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I wish to remind my colleagues that I will be anxiously awaiting a committee proposal on campaign finance reform. In the absence of such a proposal, I will work with the leadership to secure a timeframe and agreement to have S. 1806 brought directly back to the floor.

Mr. President, I invite my colleagues to again review the provisions of S. 1806 and join in this effort which should not and will not go away. I firmly believe the flaws in the direction of congressional campaign finance are in direct relation with the current inability of Congress to act on the many budget, tax, and trade challenges we face.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 11, 1986]

SOME WAYS AND MEANS MEMBERS SAW A SURGE IN CONTRIBUTIONS DURING TAX-OVERHAUL BATTLE

(By Brooks Jackson and Jeffrey H. Birnbaum)

WASHINGTON.—It came as a surprise when Rep. Wyche Fowler (D., Ga.) voted with House Republicans last year to kill the tax bill fashioned by the Ways and Means Committee on which he sits.

The bill would have removed from the tax rolls thousands of his constituents, 65% of whom are black and nearly 24% of whom live below the poverty level.

But a report filed last week at the Federal Election Commission shows that Mr. Fowler, a liberal Democrat, is courting another constituency these days as he tunes up to run for the Senate. While the committee was wrestling with the tax bill, Mr. Fowler was raising campaign contributions from a host of special interest groups and wealthy donors, including tax-shelter promoters in New York and oil drillers and real estate developers in Texas.

Executives of Integrated Resources Inc., which sells tax shelters, contributed \$10,500 last October, \$1,000 of which came from Selig Zises, its chairman and chief executive